

From: [Fagan, Nancy](#)
To: [Stubblefield, Joyce](#); [Przyborski, Jay](#); [Runnels, Charlotte](#); [Greiner, Diana](#); [Loesel, Matthew](#); [Lockett, Casey](#); [Cook, Brenda](#); [Snowbarger, Robert](#); [Anderson, Israel](#)
Subject: Re: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...
Date: Monday, April 20, 2015 3:12:37 PM
Attachments: [csi CLEAN COPY 4 20 at 308 pm.docx](#)

ok, new updated draft -

From: Stubblefield, Joyce
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 2:38 PM
To: Przyborski, Jay; Runnels, Charlotte; Greiner, Diana; Loesel, Matthew; Fagan, Nancy; Lockett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel
Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

Good catch on note below.

From: Przyborski, Jay
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 2:30 PM
To: Runnels, Charlotte; Greiner, Diana; Loesel, Matthew; Fagan, Nancy; Stubblefield, Joyce; Lockett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel
Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

I am not totally opposed to adding a citizen group to this document, but I think there are a few points we should keep in mind. First and foremost, the CSI document is only one part of this project. It does not summarize the whole project, it is merely a document the government entities and corporate partners are signing to memorialize their commitments. If the purpose of this document is to memorialize the role of everyone involved in the Alexandria/Pineville Community Focus Project, then we need to go back to the drawing board, as we are now talking to many different faith-based groups, churches, educational institutions, and the list continues to grow. As for the citizens, they are not committing to do anything here. Rather, the actions described in the CSI are for their benefit, as is made clear in sections A and B. We could add a sentence clarifying that this is part of a larger project and that purpose of this document is to address how the business community will contribute.

Two other concerns just from a practical standpoint: 1) at some other sites, I have seen problems where an active citizen group speaks for all citizens in the area, and a divide grows regarding who is speaking for whom. It makes me nervous to have one person sign the CSI for all the citizens in the community. That seems presumptuous. We can avoid that by incorporating citizen interest in ways besides assigning one group as a signatory. 2) if we begin adding citizen groups as signatories, I believe it may become more difficult to achieve a final draft that ALL parties will agree to.

What if, in addition to all of the other language already in there, we change the last sentence of section A from "...for [future generations](#)" to "...for the benefit of the citizens of the Alexandria and Pineville communities." "good catch"

Thoughts?

From: Runnels, Charlotte

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 12:39 PM

To: Greiner, Diana; Loesel, Matthew; Przyborski, Jay; Fagan, Nancy; Stubblefield, Joyce; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel

Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

This cannot be a community initiative without having the community or communities being a vital part of the initiative. Somewhere in the document there needs to be a connection made as to the role that they will play in the process. We want there to be meaningful involvement on all parties involved.

From: Greiner, Diana

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 12:35 PM

To: Loesel, Matthew; Przyborski, Jay; Fagan, Nancy; Stubblefield, Joyce; Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel

Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

Oops! Sorry, that sent way before I was ready!

In the first version, there was a comment about decisions being made by “the Parties.” I think it’s better to keep at least a representative for the community as a signatory to ensure they are kept in the decision making process.

From: Loesel, Matthew

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 12:24 PM

To: Przyborski, Jay; Fagan, Nancy; Stubblefield, Joyce; Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Greiner, Diana; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel

Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

Looks good to me, although I do agree with Jay’s comment, I thought we were going to say something about this being for the benefit of the community and not include the citizens as signatories...

From: Przyborski, Jay

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 12:19 PM

To: Fagan, Nancy; Stubblefield, Joyce; Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Greiner, Diana; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel; Loesel, Matthew

Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

I made some suggested edits. See attached.

From: Fagan, Nancy

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 8:41 AM

To: Stubblefield, Joyce; Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Przyborski, Jay; Greiner, Diana; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel; Loesel, Matthew

Subject: Re: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

yes, good point; however, I didn't want to not include Sandra's group which is called the "Lower Third Neighborhood watch", so to address all concerned citizens, I just left it as 'concerned citizens' -

From: Stubblefield, Joyce

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 8:34 AM

To: Fagan, Nancy; Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Przyborski, Jay; Greiner, Diana; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel; Loesel, Matthew

Subject: RE: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

Ok, happy to look back at it.

Also did you want to say concern citizens or Concern Citizens?

Just checking.

Joyce.

From: Fagan, Nancy

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 8:29 AM

To: Runnels, Charlotte; Luckett, Casey; Cook, Brenda; Przyborski, Jay; Greiner, Diana; Stubblefield, Joyce; Snowbarger, Robert; Anderson, Israel; Loesel, Matthew

Subject: latest version of csi - still tweeking it...

hey guys - I think we want to send this draft out today - even tho it goes out to everyone, it is still DRAFT - so we will continue to circulate and make changes

Nancy